

OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION

65 East State Street, Suite 312

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 466-0880

CB325

E2

(2)

APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Revised 6/90

IMPORTANT: Applicant should consult the "Instructions for Completion of Project Application" for assistance in the proper completion of this form.

APPLICANT NAME
STREET

HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER

138 EAST COURT STREET

ROOM 700, COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

CITY/ZIP

CINCINNATI, OH 45202

PROJECT NAME

ROUND BOTTOM ROAD BRIDGE B-0294

PROJECT TYPE

BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

TOTAL COST

\$ 233,755.20

90 SEP 13 P 3:18

OFFICE OF THE
COUNTY ENGINEER

DISTRICT NUMBER
COUNTY

2

HAMILTON

PROJECT LOCATION ZIP CODE

45244

DISTRICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

To be completed by the District Committee ONLY

RECOMMENDED AMOUNT OF FUNDING:

\$ 210,379.68

FUNDING SOURCE (Check Only One):

State Issue 2 District Allocation

☒ Grant

☐ Loan

☐ Loan Assistance

☐ State Issue 2 Small Government Fund

☐ State Issue 2 Emergency Funds

☐ Local Transportation Improvement Fund

FOR OPWC USE ONLY

OPWC PROJECT NUMBER: _____

OPWC FUNDING AMOUNT: \$ _____

1.0 APPLICANT INFORMATION

1.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE
OFFICER
TITLE
STREET

Donald C. Schramm, P.E.-P.S.
Hamilton County Engineer
138 E. Court Street
Room 700, County Admin. Bldg.
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 632 - 8603
(513) 723 - 9748

1.2 CHIEF FINANCIAL
OFFICER
TITLE
STREET

Michael J. Maloney
Hamilton County Auditor
138 E. Court Street
Room 304-A, Co. Admin. Bldg.
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 632 - 8212
(513) 632 - 8722

1.3 PROJECT MGR
TITLE
STREET

Steve Mary, P.E.
Bridge Engineer
138 E. Court Street
Room 700
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 632 - 8527
(513) 723 - 9748

1.4 PROJECT CONTACT
TITLE
STREET

CITY/ZIP
PHONE
FAX

Steve Mary, P.E.
Bridge Engineer
138 E. Court Street
Room 700, Co. Admin. Bldg.
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 632 - 8527
(513) 723 - 9748

1.5 DISTRICT LIAISON
TITLE
STREET

CITY/ZIP
PHONE
FAX

William W. Brayshaw, P.E.-P.S.
Chief Deputy Engineer
223 W. Galbraith Rd.
Cincinnati, OH 45215
(513) 761 - 7400
(513) 761 - 9127

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

IMPORTANT: If project is multi-jurisdictional in nature, information must be consolidated for completion of this section.

2.1 **PROJECT NAME:** Round Bottom Road Bridge B-0294

2.2 **BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION - (Sections A through D):**

A. SPECIFIC LOCATION:

Round Bottom Road between Broadwell Road and Mount Carmel Road.

B. PROJECT COMPONENTS:

1. Remove existing superstructure.
2. Reface existing abutments and construct new wingwalls.
3. Install precast prestressed concrete box beam deck.
4. Site excavation and embankment.
5. Channel protection.
6. Pavement replacement.
7. Guardrail installation.

C. PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS/CHARACTERISTICS:

Single Span: 41' long
7 - (B21-48) prestressed concrete box beams
28' F/F guardrail

D. DESIGN SERVICE CAPACITY:

IMPORTANT: Detail shall be included regarding current service capacity vs proposed service level. If road or bridge project, include ADT. If water or wastewater project, include current residential rates based on monthly usage of 7,756 gallons per household.

Current ADT: 2,670
20 year projected ADT: 5,341

2.3 **REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

(Photographs/Additional Description; Capital Improvements Report; Priority List; 5-year Plan; 2-year Maintenance of Effort report, etc.) Also discuss the number of temporary and/or fulltime jobs which are likely to be created as a result of this project. Attach Pages. Refer to accompanying instructions for further detail.

3.0 PROJECT FINANCIAL INFORMATION

3.1 PROJECT ESTIMATED COSTS (Round to Nearest Dollar):

a)	Project Engineering Costs:	
	1. Preliminary Engineering	\$ _____
	2. Final Design	\$ _____
	3. Construction Supervision	\$ _____
b)	Acquisition Expenses	
	1. Land	\$ _____
	2. Right-of-Way	\$ _____
c)	Construction Costs	\$ 216,440.00
d)	Equipment Costs	\$ _____
e)	Other Direct Expenses	\$ _____
f)	Contingencies	\$ 17,315.20
g)	TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS	\$ 233,755.20

3.2 PROJECT FINANCIAL RESOURCES (Round to Nearest Dollar and Percent)

	Dollars	%
a)	Local In-Kind Contributions *	
b)	Local Public Revenues	\$ 23,375.52 10
c)	Local Private Revenues	\$ _____
d)	Other Public Revenues	
	1. ODOT	\$ _____
	2. FMHA	\$ _____
	3. OEPA	\$ _____
	4. OWDA	\$ _____
	5. CDBG	\$ _____
	6. Other _____	\$ _____
e)	OPWC Funds	
	1. Grant	\$ 210,379.68 90
	2. Loan	\$ _____
	3. Loan Assistance	\$ _____
f)	TOTAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES	\$ 233,755.20 100

* If the required local match is to be 100% In-Kind Contributions, list source of funds to be used for retainage purposes:

3.3 AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FUNDS

Indicate the status of all local share funding sources listed in section 3.2(a) through 3.4(c). In addition, if funds are coming from sources listed in section 3.2(d), the following information must be attached to this project application:

- 1) The date funds are available;
- 2) Verification of funds in the form of an agency approval letter or agency project number. Please include the name and number of the agency contact person.

3.4 PREPAID ITEMS

Definitions:

Cost -	Total Cost of the Prepaid Item.
Cost Item -	Non-construction costs, including preliminary engineering, final design, acquisition expenses (land or right-of-way).
Prepaid -	Cost items (non-construction costs directly related to the project), paid prior to receipt of fully executed Project Agreement from OPWC.
Resource Category -	Source of funds (see section 3.2).
Verification -	Invoice(s) and copies of warrant(s) used to for prepaid costs, accompanied by Project Manager's Certification (see section 1.4).

IMPORTANT: Verification of all prepaid items shall be attached to this project application.

	<u>COST ITEM</u>	<u>RESOURCE CATEGORY</u>	<u>COST</u>
1)	_____	_____	\$ _____
2)	_____	_____	\$ _____
3)	_____	_____	\$ _____
TOTAL OF PREPAID ITEMS		\$	N/A _____

3.5 REPAIR/REPLACEMENT or NEW/EXPANSION

This section need only be completed if the Project is to be funded by SI2 funds:

TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT REPAIR/REPLACEMENT	\$ 233,755.20	100 %
State Issue 2 Funds for Repair/Replacement (Not to Exceed 90%)	\$ 210,379.68	90
TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT NEW/EXPANSION	\$ 0.00	0 %
State Issue 2 Funds for New/Expansion (Not to Exceed 50%)	\$ _____	_____

4.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE

	ESTIMATED START DATE	ESTIMATED COMPLETE DATE
4.1 ENGR. DESIGN	06 / 10 / 88	09 / 30 / 90
4.2 BID PROCESS	03 / 06 / 91	03 / 28 / 91
4.3 CONSTRUCTION	05 / 01 / 91	09 / 01 / 91

5.0 APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

The Applicant Certifies That:

As the official representative of the Applicant, the undersigned certifies that: (1) he/she is legally empowered to represent the applicant in both requesting and accepting financial assistance as provided under Chapter 164 of the Ohio Revised Code and 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code; (2) that to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, all representations that are a part of this application are true and correct; (3) that all official documents and commitments of the applicant that are a part of this application have been duly authorized by the governing body of the Applicant; (4) and, should the requested financial assistance be provided, that in the execution of this project, the Applicant will comply with all assurances required by Ohio law, including those involving minority business utilization, Buy Ohio, and prevailing wages.

IMPORTANT: Applicant certifies that physical construction on the project as defined in this application has not begun, and will not begin, until a Project Agreement on this project has been issued by the Ohio Public Works Commission. Action to the contrary is evidence that OPWC funds are not necessary to complete this project.

IMPORTANT: In the event of a project cost overrun, applicant understands that the identified local match share (sections 3.2(a) through 3.2(c)) will be paid in full toward completion of this project. Unneeded OPWC funds will be returned to the funding source from which the project was financed.

Donald C. Schramm, Hamilton County Engineer

Certifying Representative (Type Name and Title)

Signature/Date Signed

Applicant shall check each of the statements below, confirming that all required information is included in this application:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | _____ | A five-year Capital Improvements Report as required in 164-1-31 of the Ohio Administrative Code and a two-year Maintenance of Local Effort Report as required in 164-1-12 of the Ohio Administrative Code. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | _____ | A registered professional engineer's estimate of useful life as required in 164-1-13 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimate shall contain engineer's <u>original seal and signature</u> . |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | _____ | A registered professional engineer's estimate of cost as required in 164-1-14 and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimate shall contain engineer's <u>original seal and signature</u> . |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | _____ | A certified copy of the legislation by the governing body of the applicant authorizing a designated official to submit this application and to execute contracts. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | YES
N/A | A copy of the cooperation agreement(s) (for projects involving more than one subdivision or district). |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | YES
N/A | Copies of all invoices and warrants for those items identified as "pre-paid" in section 4.4 of this application. |

6.0 DISTRICT COMMITTEE CERTIFICATION

The District Integrating Committee for District Number 2 Certifies That:

As the official representative of the District Public Works Integrating Committee, the undersigned hereby certifies: that this application for financial assistance as provided under Chapter 164 of the Ohio Revised Code has been duly selected by the appropriate body of the District Public Works Integrating Committee; that the project's selection was based entirely on an objective, District-oriented set of project evaluation criteria and selection methodology that are fully reflective of and in conformance with Ohio Revised Code Sections 164.05, 164.06, and 164.14, and Chapter 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code; and that the amount of financial assistance hereby recommended has been prudently derived in consideration of all other financial resources available to the project. As evidence of the District's due consideration of required project evaluation criteria, the results of this project's ratings under such criteria are attached to this application.

Donald C. Schramm, Chairman, District #2 Integrating Committee
Certifying Representative (Type Name and Title)

Donald C. Schramm / 1/18/91
Signature/Date Signed

HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE
5 YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN - 1991 THROUGH 1995

DECEMBER 3, 1990

PAGE NO. 1

PROJECT NAME	PROJECT	TYPE	LIMITS	ESTIMATED COST	COMMENTS	CONTRACTOR	PROJECTED YEAR	CONSULTANT
GALBRAITH ROAD	ROAD	RP	COLERAINE TO W.C.H. CORP.	\$1,500,000.00			1991	SAVAGE-WALKER
LAWRENCEBURG RD.	BRIDGE	RE	STEPHENS TO SUSPENSION BR	\$500,000.00			1991	KING & GAVARIS
DELHI ROAD	ROAD	EX	GREENWELL TO CORP.	\$1,500,000.00			1991	JOE ALLEN
ROUND BOTTOM RD.	BRIDGE	RE	E. OF BROADWELL	\$200,000.00			1991	SAVAGE-WALKER
JESSUP ROAD	ROAD	EX	CHEVIST TO COLERAINE	\$750,000.00			1991	McGILL, SMITH, PUNSHON
HARRISON ROAD	ROAD	RP	SHEED TO MULLEN	\$800,000.00			1991	JOE ALLEN
E MIAMI/HARRISON	ROAD	EX	INTERSECTION	\$400,000.00			1991	BURGESS & NIPLE
RAPID RUN ROAD	ROAD	EX	INTER. & A. FERRY	\$600,000.00	LTIP		1991	I.H. - JOE COTTRILL
SYLVED LAKE	ROAD	EX	SIDNEY TO CORP.	\$500,000.00	ESTABLISHMENT		1991	AMB CONSULTANTS
RACE ROAD	ROAD	EX	BR. TOWN TO HARRISON	\$300,000.00	ISSUE 2		1991	JOE ALLEN
CLOUGH ROAD	ROAD	RE	WAGEL TO EIGHT MILE	\$400,000.00			1991	TRUMAN-YOUNG
WOLFANGLE ROAD	ROAD	RE	MCLOUGH PIKE	\$600,000.00			1991	TRUMAN-YOUNG
RESURFACING VARIOUS	ROADS	RP	VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS	\$3,000,000.00			1991	
CLOUGH ROAD	BRIDGE	RE	E. OF BIRKSHIRE	\$400,000.00			1991	
BANK ROAD	BRIDGE	RE	N. OF CREST	\$280,000.00			1991	
ROSALTA ROAD	BRIDGE	RE	E. LAWRENCEBURG	\$185,000.00			1991	
VARIOUS MUNICIPAL BRIDGES	BRIDGE	RE	LUMP SUM	\$500,000.00			1991	
ANDERSON FERRY RD.	ROAD	EX	SIDNEY TO CROOKSHANK	\$450,000.00			1991	BALKE
SPRINGDALE ROAD	ROAD	EX	SEASONS DR. TO PIPPIN	\$900,000.00	LTIP		1991	I.H. - JERRY CHESSEY
MCDDY CREEK ROAD	BRIDGE	RE	E. DEVIL'S BACKBONE	\$300,000.00			1991	
PLAINFIELD ROAD	ROAD	RP	GALBRAITH TO CROSS COUNTY	\$521,000.00	ISSUE 2		1991	BRANDSTETTER
SIGNALIZATION	ROAD	NW	VARIOUS INTERSECTIONS	\$250,000.00			1991	I.H. PROJECT
MISC. GUARDRAIL, PAVEMENT	ROAD	RE	VARIOUS	\$200,000.00			1991	I.H. PROJECT
MARKERS & PIPE	ROAD	NW	VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS	\$350,000.00			1991	I.H. PROJECT
UNION CEMETERY	BRIDGE	RE	E. OF MONTGOMERY	\$250,000.00			1991	
CLEVELAND-WARSAW ROAD	ROAD	EX	E. WEEB, A. FERRY, EBENEZER	\$400,000.00			1991	JOE ALLEN
NEWTOWN ROAD	ROAD	NW	ENCLOSURE CRK IN CONC. BOX	\$400,000.00			1991	I. H. - JOHN BECK
SALEM ROAD	ROAD	RE	KELLOGG TO BEECHMONT	\$800,000.00	ISSUE 2		1991	JOE ALLEN
CROSS COUNTY ACCESS RD.	ROAD	NW	AMERLEY - E. RIDGE ROAD	\$800,000.00			1991	WOOLPERT
HARRISON ROAD	ROAD	RE	KILBY ROAD INTERSECTION	\$500,000.00			1991	
McKELVEY ROAD	ROAD	RE	CURVE MODIFICATION	\$75,000.00			1991	I. H. - JOE COTTRILL
HARRISON ROAD	ROAD	RE	E. WESSELMAN INTERSECTION	\$300,000.00			1991	I.H. - RON WOOD
TOTAL FOR 1991				\$18,911,000.00				
CHEVIST ROAD	ROAD	EX	N. BEND TO TALLAHASSEE	\$350,000.00			1992	PFLUM
E KEMPER ROAD	ROAD	EX	SNIDER TO MONTGOMERY	\$500,000.00			1992	
SIGNALIZATION	ROAD	NW	VARIOUS INTERSECTIONS	\$250,000.00			1992	I.H. PROJECT
HARRISON ROAD	ROAD	EX	DRY FORK TO CORP.	\$750,000.00			1992	JOE ALLEN
PIPPIN ROAD	ROAD	EX	SPRING. TO J. GRAY	\$150,000.00			1992	BALKE
ADAMS ROAD	ROAD	EX	PIPPIN TO MILES	\$300,000.00			1992	McGILL, SMITH, PUNSHON
RESURFACING VARIOUS	ROADS	RP	VARIES	\$1,000,000.00			1992	
VARIOUS MUNICIPAL BRIDGES	BRIDGE	RE	LUMP SUM	\$900,000.00			1992	
VARIOUS SLIDE REPAIR	ROAD	RP	LUMP SUM	\$200,000.00			1992	
EAST KEMPER RD.	ROAD	EX	McKINNEY TO CORP.	\$500,000.00			1992	SAVAGE-WALKER
MISC. GUARDRAIL, PAVEMENT	ROAD	RE	VARIOUS	\$200,000.00			1992	
MARKERS & PIPE	ROAD	NW	VARIOUS ROADS-COUNTY WIDE	\$350,000.00			1992	I.H. PROJECT
ROLLINS LAKE	BRIDGE	RE	E. FIVE MILE ROAD	\$300,000.00			1992	
BEECHMONT/FADDISON INT.	ROAD	EX	INTERSECTION WIDEN & REHA	\$300,000.00			1992	
DALY ROAD	ROAD	RE	COMPTON TO MEREDITH	\$150,000.00			1992	
MILES ROAD	ROAD	RE	SIDEWALK REPAIRS	\$100,000.00			1992	
PIPPIN ROAD	ROAD	RE	ADAMS TO SPRINGDALE	\$300,000.00			1992	
TOTAL FOR 1992				\$8,600,000.00				

TYPE PROJECT:

RP = REPAIR
RE = REPLACEMENT
NW = NEW CONSTRUCTION
OR RELOCATION

HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE
5 YEAR CAPITOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

DECEMBER 3, 1990

PAGE NO. 2

PROJECT NAME	PROJECT	TYPE	LIMITS	ESTIMATED COST	COMMENTS	CONTRACTOR	PROJECTED YEAR	CONSULTANT
DELHI ROAD	ROAD	EX	1 NEEB INTERSECTION	\$100,000.00			1993	I.H. - JOHN BECK
KENWOOD ROAD	ROAD	EX	GALBRAITH TO C. CO.	\$500,000.00			1993	
GALBRAITH ROAD	ROAD	EX	KENWOOD TO MONT.	\$200,000.00			1993	
W SHARON ROAD	ROAD	RP	MILL TO WINTON	\$200,000.00			1993	
GALBRAITH ROAD	ROAD	RP	COLERAIN TO CHEVIOT	\$200,000.00			1993	
PIPPIN ROAD	ROAD	RP	ADAMS TO SPRINGDALE	\$250,000.00			1993	McGILL, SMITH, PUNSHOW
CROSS COUNTY	ROAD	EX	RIDGE - EAST	\$500,000.00			1993	WOOLPERT
CONREY/E KEMPER	ROAD	EX	INTERSECTION	\$200,000.00			1993	TRUMAN-YOUNG
E KEMPER/SEIDER	ROAD	EX	INTERSECTION	\$500,000.00			1993	TRUMAN-YOUNG
VARIOUS MUNICIPAL BRIDGES		RE	LUMP SUM	\$900,000.00			1993	
VARIOUS SLIDE REPAIR	ROAD	RP	LUMP SUM	\$200,000.00			1993	
RESURFACING VARIOUS	ROADS	RP	VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS	\$3,000,000.00			1993	
MISC. GUARDRAIL, PAVEMENT								
MARKERS & PIPE	ROAD	NW	VARIOUS RDS. - COUNTY WID	\$350,000.00			1993	I.H. PROJECT
SIGNALIZATION	ROAD	NW	VARIOUS INTERSECTIONS	\$250,000.00			1993	I.H. PROJECT
TOTAL FOR 1993				\$7,350,000.00				
RAPID RUN ROAD	ROAD	EX	PONTIUS TO MARTINI	\$500,000.00			1994	TOM GRAHAM
E KEMPER ROAD	ROAD	EX	E HART. TO SNIDER	\$200,000.00			1994	
LOVELAND ROAD	ROAD	EX	HOPEWELL TO LOVELAND	\$250,000.00			1994	SAVAGE-WALKER
WINTON ROAD	ROAD	RP	N BEND TO GALBRAITH	\$200,000.00			1994	
WINTON ROAD	ROAD	EX	GALBRAITH TO G HILLS	\$300,000.00			1994	
VARIOUS MUNICIPAL BRIDGES	BRIDGE	RE	LUMP SUM	\$1,000,000.00			1994	
VARIOUS SLIDE REPAIR	ROAD	RP	LUMP SUM	\$200,000.00			1994	
SIGNALIZATION	ROAD	NW	VARIOUS INTERSECTIONS	\$250,000.00			1994	I.H. PROJECT
RESURFACING VARIOUS	ROADS	RP	VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS	\$3,000,000.00			1994	
MISC. GUARDRAIL, PAVEMENT								
MARKERS & PIPE	ROAD	NW	VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS	\$350,000.00			1994	I.H. PROJECT
MONTGOMERY ROAD	ROAD	EX	KENWOOD TO HOSBROOK	\$325,000.00			1994	
TOTAL FOR 1994				\$6,575,000.00				
RITTENHOUSE ROAD	ROAD	EX	MT. NEEB TO CLIFF	\$400,000.00			1995	
BOOMER ROAD	ROAD	RE	MICH. ANTHONY TO RACE ROA	\$500,000.00			1995	
WEST SHARON ROAD	ROAD	RE	MILL ROAD TO WINTON ROAD	\$500,000.00			1995	
RESURFACING VARIOUS	ROADS	RP	VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS	\$3,000,000.00			1995	
MISC. GUARDRAIL, PAVEMENT								
MARKERS & PIPE	ROAD	NW	VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS	\$350,000.00			1995	
FIELDS - ERTTEL ROAD	ROAD	EX	MONTGOMERY - WEST	\$1,000,000.00			1995	
FIELDS - ERTTEL ROAD	ROAD	EX	MONTGOMERY - EAST	\$1,000,000.00			1995	
TOTAL FOR 1995				\$6,750,000.00				

PROJECT TYPE:

RP = REPAIR
EX = EXPANSION
RE = REPLACEMENT
NW = NEW CONSTRUCTION
OR RELOCATION

NOTE: MORE PROJECTS MAY BE ADDED FOR THE 1992, 1993, 1994 AND 1995 FISCAL YEARS.
FIGURES REPRESENT PROPOSED PROJECTS AND MAY BE ALTERED IN FUTURE YEARS TO REFLECT CHANGING FUNDING REQUIREMENTS.

TWO-YEAR MAINTENANCE OF LOCAL EFFORT

HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE

Project Type:

Rp - Repair
Ex - Expansion
Re - Replacement
Nw - New Construction or Relocation

Funding Source:

L - Local
F - Federal
S - State

Project Description	Project Type				Funding Source and %			Appropriated or Expended
	Rp	Ex	Re	Nw	L	F	S	
1990 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS								
1. Old Colerain Bridge			X		20		80	\$ 291,425.00
2. Taylor Road Bridges			X		100			255,930.00
3. Westwood Northern Blvd.			X		18		82	211,803.00
4. Curb Ramp Installations				X	100			80,005.80
5. Murray Avenue			X		100			153,580.25
6. Eight Mile Road			X		100			256,124.50
7. Dry Fork Road			X		100			87,137.00
8. Sidewalk Repairs	X				100			47,437.00
9. Resurface Various Road (First Contract)			X		100			827,238.35
10. Rapid Run/Neeb Road Intersection Improvement		X			70		30	405,810.00
11. Harrison Road Pierwall			X		100			71,107.50
12. Ebenezer Road			X		100			68,629.50
13. Winton Rd. Bridge FPK-0844			X		100			77,800.00
14. Winton Road Bridge B-0673			X		100			290,230.00
15. Banning Road			X		100			74,215.00
16. Dick Road				X	100			75,170.00
17. Springdale Road		X			23		77	782,828.72
18. Reed Hartman Highway			X		30		70	445,026.85
19. Foley Road			X		35		65	865,159.88
20. Resurfacing Various Roads (Second Contract)			X		100			1,094,523.80
21. Cleves-Warsaw Road			X		100			390,000.00
22. Resurfacing Various Roads (Third Contract)			X		100			1,210,000.00
23. Guardrail Program				X	100			300,000.00
24. Culvert Program				X	100			250,000.00
25. Pavement Markers				X	100			161,000.00
26. Sidewalk Contract	X				100			9,000.00

TOTAL = \$ 8,781,180.85

TWO-YEAR MAINTENANCE OF LOCAL EFFORT REPORT

HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE

Project Type:

p - Repair
 x - Expansion
 e - Replacement
 w - New Construction or Relocation

Funding Source:

L - Local
 F - Federal
 S - State

Project Description	Project Type				Funding Source and %			Appropriated or Expended
	Rp	Ex	Re	Nw	L	F	S	
<u>1989 Capital Improvements:</u>								
1. Snider Road Box Culvert			X		100			\$ 155,216.74
2. Resurfacing Contract No. 1	X				100			280,771.10
3. Fields Ertel Box Culvert			X		100			52,539.00
4. Curb Ramps Contract No. 1 Colerain/Springfield Twps.			X	X	100			30,000.00
5. Curb Ramps Contract No. 2 Delhi/Green Twps.			X	X	100			29,018.00
6. Curb Ramps Contract No. 3 Anderson/Columbia Twps.			X	X	100			10,361.00
7. Sheits Rd. Slide Correction with Pier Wall	X				100			421,655.50
8. Resurfacing Contract No. 2	X				100			710,610.45
9. Eight Mile and Ayers Rds. Hump Removals			X		100			180,996.85
10. 1989 Bridge Painting Contr.	X				100			89,924.00
11. Lawrenceburg Rd. Bridge Demolition					100			74,800.00
12. Loveland-Madeira Rd. Widen.		X			100			21,636.00
13. Waycross Rd. & Civic Center Drive Improvements	X			X	100			416,203.66
14. Hosbrook Rd. Resurfacing & Galbraith Rd. at Montgomery Widening & Resurfacing	X	X			100			64,025.60
15. Five Mile Rd. Widening & Resurfacing	X	X			100			329,094.60
16. Resurfacing Contract No. 3	X				100			108,878.60
17. Union Cemetery Rd. Curve Modification & Mason Rd. Widening		X	X		100			105,814.00
18. 1989 Guardrail Contract		X	X	X	100			242,803.00
19. Devil's Backbone Rd. & Cleves-Warsaw Rd. Intersection Improvement	X			X	100			169,265.50
20. Old Colerain Bridge B-0404			X		10		90	1,324,655.00
21. Westwood Northern Rd. Improvement	X				10		90	1,044,451.00
22. Foley Rd. Improvement	X				10		90	594,747.00

TOTAL 1989

\$6,457,437.00

TWO-YEAR MAINTENANCE OF LOCAL EFFORT REPORT

HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE

Project Type:

Rp - Repair
 Ex - Expansion
 Re - Replacement
 NW - New Construction or Relocation

Funding Source:

L - Local
 F - Federal
 S - State

Project Description	Project Type				Funding Source and %			Appropriated or Expended
	Rp	Ex	Re	Nw	L	F	S	
<u>1988 Capital Improvements:</u>		X						
1. Daly Road Improvements	X				100			\$ 587,777.77
2. North Bend Rd. Lane Addition at Cheviot Rd.		X			100			70,610.25
3. Rapid Run Road, Section 1			X		100			413,811.40
4. Berkshire Road Bridge (B-0022)			X		100			379,256.85
5. Betts Ave. Improvement	X				100			368,092.07
6. Race Road-Bridgetown Intersection Improvement	X	X		X	100			149,090.50
7. Resurfacing Contract No. 1	X				100			250,181.52
8. East Miami River Road Slide Correction with Pier Wall	X				100			317,204.50
9. Resurfacing Contract No. 2	X				100			103,879.84
10. West Road Improvements	X	X	X		100			525,921.48
1. Wesselman Road Bridge (B-0310)			X		100			100,894.00
2. Rapid Run Rd., Section 2			X		100			706,547.44
3. Montgomery Rd.-Hosbrook Rd. Intersection Improvements	X	X			100			381,822.80
4. Harrison Rd. Bridge over Great Miami River (B-0754)			X		100			2,297,141.20
5. East Miami River Rd. Slide Correction	X				100			157,267.00
6. Hopper Rd. at Eight Mile Rd. Culvert Replacement			X		100			54,470.00
7. New Haven Rd. Bridge Replacement (B-0632)		X	X		25	75		248,605.80
8. Cheviot-Blue Rock HES Project Safety Upgrade		X			25	75		69,200.00

TOTAL 1988

\$7,181,724.40



County of Hamilton

DONALD C. SCHRAMM, P.E.-P.S. COUNTY ENGINEER

700 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

138 EAST COURT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202


GENERAL INFORMATION (513) 632-8523


CONSTRUCTION COSTS:

The opinion of Project Construction Costs is based on current unit price experience and is subject to adjustment upon completion of detailed plans and receipt of an acceptable proposal and bid by a qualified Contractor.

STATEMENT OF USEFUL LIFE:

As required by Chapter 164-1-13 of the Ohio Administrative Code, I hereby certify that the Round Bottom Road Bridge B-0294 will have a useful life of at least 50 years.




DONALD C. SCHRAMM, P.E.-P.S.
HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER


ROUND BOTTOM ROAD BRIDGE B-0294

Line No.	Spec. Item	Description	Unit	Qty.	Labor	Unit Price of Material	Combined	Total Price
1	201	Clearing & Grubbing	L.S.	L.S.			L.S.	8,000.00
2	202	Structure or Portions of Structure Removed	L.S.	L.S.			L.S.	10,000.00
3	202	Guardrail Removed	LIN.FT.	320			3.00	960.00
4	202	Fence Removed	LIN.FT.	230			2.00	460.00
5	203	Excavation	CU.YD.	670			10.00	6,700.00
6	203	Embankment	CU.YD.	1750			15.00	26,250.00
7	203	Subgrade Compaction	SQ.YD.	350			2.00	700.00
8	301	Bituminous Aggregate Base	CU.YD.	150			100.00	15,000.00
9	304	Aggregate Base	CU.YD.	150			30.00	4,500.00
10	310	Sub-base	CU.YD.	50			35.00	1,750.00
11	402	Asphalt Concrete	CU.YD.	70			125.00	8,750.00
12	404	Asphalt Concrete	CU.YD.	50			125.00	6,250.00
13	407	Tack Coat	GAL.	130			1.00	130.00
14	408	Bituminous Prime Coat	GAL.	250			1.00	250.00
15	409	Seal Coat	GAL.	180			1.00	180.00
16	409	Cover Aggregate	CU.YD.	7			50.00	350.00
17	503	Unclassified Excavation	CU.YD.	550			15.00	8,250.00

ROUND BOTTOM ROAD BRIDGE B-0294

Line No.	Spec. Item	Description	Unit	Qty.	Labor	Unit Price of Material	Combined	Total Price
18	509	Reinforcing Steel	LBS.	8500			0.50	4,250.00
19	511	Class "C" Concrete, Footing	CU.YD.	90			200.00	18,000.00
20	511	Class "C" Concrete, Stem	CU.YD.	100			250.00	25,000.00
21	512	Type D Waterproofing	SQ.YD.	160			15.00	2,400.00
22	515	Prestressed Concrete Box Beams	EACH	7			4,000.00	28,000.00
23	516	Elastomeric Bearing Pads	EACH	28			75.00	2,100.00
24	516	1/8" Preformed Bearing Pads	SQ.FT.	10			10.00	100.00
25	516	Preformed Expansion Joint Filler	SQ.FT.	210			10.00	2,100.00
26	517	Bridge Railing	LIN.FT.	100			45.00	4,500.00
27	518	Porous Backfill	CU.YD.	30			30.00	900.00
28	601	Rock Channel Protection, Type A	CU.YD.	100			50.00	5,000.00
29	601	Paved Gutter, Type 1-2	LIN.FT.	140			20.00	2,800.00
30	602	Concrete Masonry	CU.YD.	2			500.00	1,000.00
31	603	18" Conduit, Type C	LIN.FT.	24			50.00	1,200.00
32	604	Catch Basin, Type CB-5	EACH	1			1200.00	1,200.00
33	606	Guardrail, Type 5	LIN.FT.	400			15.00	6,000.00
34	614	Maintaining Traffic	L.S.	L.S.			L.S.	5,000.00

[illegible]



STATUS OF FUNDS REPORT

PROJECT: ROUND BOTTOM BRIDGE B-0294

This is to certify that the sum of \$ 23,375.52 will be available as the local matching funds in connection with Hamilton County's application requesting, through the District 2 Integrating Committee, financial assistance for the above named project.

The source of the local match will be Hamilton County's road and bridge funds derived from State of Ohio fuel tax and license tag fees.

Local matching funds will be encumbered and certified upon completion of the Project Agreement with the Ohio Public Works Commission.

HAMILTON COUNTY

Chief Executive Officer:


DONALD C. SCHRAMM, P.E.-P.S.
HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER

Chief Financial Officer:


MICHAEL J. MALONEY
HAMILTON COUNTY AUDITOR

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

TEMPORARY JOBS:

This project will result in temporary employment due to construction work. Approximately ten (10) to fifteen (15) short-term construction jobs will be created as a result of this project.

FULL-TIME JOBS:

We are not able to foresee any new, full-time employment as a result of this project.

RESOLUTION APPOINTING DONALD C. SCHRAMM, HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER,
AS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO; A POLITICAL
SUBDIVISION OF DISTRICT #2 AS CREATED UNDER SECTION 164.03 O.R.C.

BY THE BOARD:

WHEREAS, HB 704 enacted legislation to establish 19 District Integrating Committees throughout the State of Ohio and Hamilton County comprise District #2; and

WHEREAS, this Board did adopt a Resolution June 1, 1988, Vol. 230 Image 1347, appointing Donald C. Schramm Chairman of said District #2; and

WHEREAS, this Board did adopt a resolution On October 18, 1989, Vol. 236, Image 623, appointing Donald C. Schramm, Hamilton County Engineer, to the position of Chief Executive Officer of District #2 Integrating Committee in accordance with HB 704; and

WHEREAS, this should have read to the position of Chief Executive Officer for the Political Subdivision of Hamilton County, Ohio.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Hamilton County, Ohio that Donald C. Schramm, Hamilton County Engineer, be appointed to the position of Chief Executive Officer for the Political Subdivision of Hamilton County, Ohio of District #2 division of the state, the term to be concurrent with the Resolution as previously adopted on June 1, 1988.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Board of County Commissioners of Hamilton County, State of Ohio, this 8th day of November, 1989.

Ms. Beckwith AYE


Mr. DeCourcy AYE


Mr. Taft, AYE

CERTIFICATE OF CLERK

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of a Resolution adopted by this Board of County Commissioners in session this 8th day of November, 1989.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Office of the Office of County Commissioners of Hamilton County, Ohio, this 8th day of November, 1989.




Angela Petzel, Clerk
Board of County Commissioners
Hamilton County, Ohio

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT INFORMATION

For 1991, jurisdictions shall complete the State application form for Issue 2, Small Government, or Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) funding. In addition, the District 2 Integrating Committee requests the following information to determine which projects are funded. Do **NOT** request a specific type of funding desired, as this is decided by the District Integrating Committee.

1. Of the total infrastructure within the jurisdiction which is similar to the infrastructure of this project, what percentage can be classified as being in **poor** condition, adequacy and/or serviceability?

Typical examples are:

Road percentage = $\frac{\text{Miles of road that are in poor condition}}{\text{Total miles of road within jurisdiction}}$

Storm percentage = $\frac{\text{Miles of storm sewers that are in poor condition}}{\text{Total miles of storm sewers within jurisdiction}}$

Bridge percentage = $\frac{\text{Number of bridges that are in poor condition}}{\text{Number of bridges within jurisdiction}}$

40 bridges ÷ 468 bridges = 8.5%

2. What is the condition of the existing infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded? For bridges, base condition on latest general appraisal and condition rating.

Closed	_____	Poor	<u> X </u>
Fair	_____	Good	_____

Give a brief statement of the nature of the deficiency of the present facility such as: inadequate load capacity (bridge); surface type and width; number of lanes; structural condition; substandard design elements such as berm width, grades, curves, sight distances, drainage structures, or inadequate service capacity. If known, give the approximate age of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

Current bridge condition = 2. Sufficiency rating = 16.5 S.D.

Built in 1918 - restricted to 4 wheel vehicles only - no trucks.

SFN 3133001

3. If State Issue 2 funds are awarded, how soon (in weeks or months) after completion of the agreement with OPWC would the opening of bids occur?

1 month

Please indicate the current status of the project development by circling the appropriate answers below.

- a) Has the Consultant been selected? Yes No N/A
- b) Preliminary development or engineering completed? Yes No N/A
- c) Detailed construction plans completed? Yes No N/A
- d) All Right-of-Way acquired? Yes No N/A
- e) Utility coordination completed? Yes No N/A

Give estimate of time, in weeks or months, to complete any item above not yet completed.

Right-of-Way acquisition - 4 months.

4. How will the proposed infrastructure activity impact the general health, welfare, and safety of the service area? (Typical examples include the effects of the completed project on accident rates, emergency response time, fire protection, health hazards, user benefits, and commerce.)

Proposed infrastructure will replace a structurally deficient bridge which is restricted to 4 wheel vehicles only - no trucks.

5. For any project involving GRANTS, the local jurisdiction must provide a **MINIMUM OF 10%** of the anticipated construction cost. Additionally, the local jurisdiction must pay 100% of the costs of preliminary engineering, inspection of construction, and Right-of-Way acquisition. If a project is to be funded under Issue 2 or Small Government, the costs of any betterment/expansion are 100% local. Local matching funds must either be currently on deposit with the jurisdiction, or certified as having been approved or encumbered by an outside agency (MRF, CDBG, etc.). Proposed funding must be shown on the Project Application under Section 3.2, "Project Financial Resources". **For a project involving LOANS or CREDIT ENHANCEMENTS, 100% of construction costs are eligible for funding, with no local match required.**

What matching funds are to be used for this project? (i.e. Federal, State, MRF, Local, etc.)

Hamilton County Funds

To what extent are matching funds to be utilized, expressed as a percentage of anticipated CONSTRUCTION costs?

Ten (10) percent of construction costs.

6. Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a complete ban or partial ban of the use or expansion of use for the involved infrastructure? (Typical examples include weight limits, truck restrictions, and moratoriums or limitations on issuance of new building permits.) **THE BAN MUST HAVE AN ENGINEERING JUSTIFICATION TO BE CONSIDERED VALID.**

COMPLETE BAN _____ PARTIAL BAN X NO BAN _____

Will the ban be removed after the project is completed? YES X NO _____

Document with specific information explaining what type of ban currently exists and the agency that imposed the ban.

Resolution limiting "Existing Structure to 4 Wheel Vehicles Only - No Trucks" was approved by Board of County Commissioners on February 28, 1990.

7. What is the total number of existing users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Use appropriate criteria such as households, traffic counts, ridership figures for public transit, daily users, etc., and equate to an equal measurement of users:

Current ADT: 2,670 2,670 X 1.2 = 3,204 users

For roads and bridges, multiply current documented Average Daily Traffic by 1.2 occupants per car (I.T.E. estimated conversion factor) to determine users per day. Ridership figures for public transit must be documented. Where the facility currently has any restrictions or is partially closed, use documented traffic counts prior to restriction. For storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and other related facilities, multiply the number of households in the service area by four (4) to determine the approximate number of users per day.

8. The Ohio Public Works Commission requires that all jurisdictions applying for project funding develop a five year overall Capital Improvement Plan that shall be updated annually. The Plan is to include an inventory and condition survey of existing capital improvements, and a list detailing a schedule for capital improvements and/or maintenance. Both Five-Year Overall and Five-Year Issue 2 Capital Improvement Plans are required.

Copies of theses Plans are to be submitted to the District Integrating Committee at the same time the Project Application is submitted.

9. Is the infrastructure to be an improved part of a facility that has regional significance? (Consider the number of jurisdictions served, size of service area, trip lengths, functional classification, and length of route.) Provide supporting information.

Project has regional impact, serving eastern Hamilton County and western Clermont County (Milford Area).



Narrow
Pavement

3133001/378/B0294 ROUND BOT RD [7907-28A]

85

ROUND BOTTOM RD.



Deteriorated
Concrete
Beams

3133001/378/B0294 ROUND BOT RD [7907-29A]

84

ROUND BOTTOM RD.

OHIO INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PROGRAM (ISSUE 2)
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (LTIP)
DISTRICT 2 - HAMILTON COUNTY
1991 PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

57

JURISDICTION/AGENCY: HAMILTON COUNTY ENGINEER

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION:

ROUND BOTTOM ROAD BRIDGE B 0294

PROPOSED FUNDING:

ELIGIBLE CATEGORY:

POINTS

- 10 1) Type of project
- 10 Points - Bridge, road, stormwater
5 Points - All other projects
- 5 2) If Issue 2/LTIP funds are granted, how soon after the Project Agreement is completed would a construction contract be awarded? (Even though the jurisdictions will be asked this question, the Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience.)
- 10 Points - Will definitely be awarded in 1991
5 Points - Some doubt whether it can be awarded in 1991
0 Points - No way it can be awarded in 1991
- 15 3) What is the condition of the infrastructure to be replaced or repaired? For bridges, base condition on latest general appraisal and condition rating.
- 15 Points - Poor condition
10 Points - Fair to Poor condition
5 Points - Fair condition

NOTE: If infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will NOT be considered for Issue 2/LTIP funding, unless it is a betterment project that will improve serviceability.

5

- 4) If the project is built, what will be its effect on the facility's serviceability?

5 Points - Will significantly effect serviceability
4 Points -
3 Points - Will moderately effect serviceability
2 Points -
1 Point - Will have little or no effect on serviceability

0

- 5) Of the total infrastructure within the jurisdiction which is similar to the infrastructure of this project, what portion can be classified as being in poor or worse condition, and/or inadequate in service?

10 Points - 50% and over
8 Points - 40% to 49%
6 Points - 30% to 39%
4 Points - 20% to 29%
2 Points - 10% to 19%
0 Points - Less than 10%

10

- 6) How important is the project to the health, welfare, and safety of the public and the citizens of the District and/or the service area?

10 Points - Significant importance
8 Points -
6 Points - Moderate importance
4 Points -
2 Points - Minimal importance

4

- 7) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

10 Points - Poor
8 Points -
6 Points - Fair
4 Points -
2 Points - Excellent

1

- 8) What matching funds are being committed to the project, expressed as a percentage of the TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST? Matching funds may be local, Federal, ODOT, MRF, etc. or a combination of funds.

5 Points - More than 50%
4 Points - 40% to 49.9%
3 Points - 30% to 39.9%
2 Points - 20% to 29.9%
1 Point - 10% to 19.9%

MINIMUM 10% MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED

5

- 9) Has any formal action by a Federal, State, or local governmental agency resulted in a partial or complete ban on the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure? Examples include weight limits on structures and moratoriums on building permits in a particular area due to local flooding downstream. Points can be awarded ONLY if construction of the project being rated will cause the ban to be removed.

10 Points - Complete ban
5 Points - Partial ban
0 Points - No ban

4

- 10) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Appropriate criteria includes traffic counts & households served, when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for roads and bridges, but only when certifiable ridership figures are provided.

10 Points - 10,000 and Over
8 Points - 7,500 to 9,999
6 Points - 5,000 to 7,499
4 Points - 2,500 to 4,999
2 Points - 2,499 and Under

2

- 11) Does the infrastructure have regional impact? Consider originations & destinations of traffic, size of service area, number of jurisdictions served, functional classification, etc.

5 Points - Major impact
4 Points -
3 Points - Moderate impact
2 Points -
1 Point - Minimal or no impact

TOTAL AVAILABLE = 100 POINTS